

Corrections for biennial adjustments, there was no additional request for staffing then either. What had occurred actually is there was some savings that we realized out at the Department of Corrections, both through a traditional situation of vacancy savings where just given a pool of employees that large, you are not exact, and so there are some vacancy savings there, though it is a little larger than normal this year. Secondly is the simply fact that, because of some construction that is going on and some of the operations openings have been postponed, there was some savings there. So if you look on page 20 of the rose-colored sheet, you will see operations savings of 897,000 and some...actually some additional staffing of 21 that we, have, we, I say we, the Appropriations Committee recommendation already includes, and that 21, that recommendation for 21 staff people, which is not all security staff, there is a variety of people, was requested by the Department of Corrections in February. Now, initially, the \$900,000 operational savings, it was, indeed, intended that the bulk of that money would, originally I think, I'm speaking for the administration here, originally that money was going to go towards paying for LB 988, the juvenile crime package. The way that bill and the A bill has been crafted, LB 988 contains a General Fund appropriation. So, theoretically, this is a pure savings here but the fact is, is that that money has already been spent, so to speak, on everything else in the budget. So this amendment is a net cost, so to speak, of 600,000. I believe is the number, I lost it in front of me here. So every, everybody needs to understand that that an argument could be made that the Department of Corrections had this savings, why not transfer it over to the security personnel. Well, that argument, unfortunately, if that would have happened in December, it probably could have been done. An adjustment at this point in time is a pure cost measure, so to speak, off the bottom of the sheet, so that everyone understands that. It is one of those things, frustrating enough, I think there may indeed be some problems out there, I am not going to make light of the situation but the fact is that when their biennial budget was requested, when the deficit budget was requested, at that point in time, there was never any request for additional personnel. Now we've already came in and put 21 people, the equivalent, I have an amendment coming up later to actually raise the personal service limits. We have already put 21 more staff people in than the original request. This amendment is for another 21 people, and though I think I have some concerns out there, I don't...I just don't know whether to continue to put that in. But one last thing I